

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 24 remain in the application.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 24 under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Eisawa.

Features of the data distribution system according to the present invention are to divide, at an information service center, a desired program into an outline part and a supplement part and to transmit the outline part first followed by the supplement part to a terminal equipment.

At the terminal equipment, the outline part is received first followed by the supplement part of the desired program, the outline part and the supplement part are recombined to restore and store the desired program while the supplement part is being received, the outline part is reproduced while the outline part is being received, and the reproduction of the outline part is continued while the supplemental part is being received until the reproduction of the outline part is completed.

Independent claims 1 and 24 recite these features of the present invention which are illustrated in Figs. 6A-B of the present application, for example.

An advantage of these positively recited features of the present invention is that the user of the terminal

device can monitor, with a degraded quality, the desired program while the desired program is restored and stored in a hard disk, for example.

It is respectfully submitted that Ebisawa fails to show or suggest the above-noted features of the present invention for the following reasons.

The "control signal" pointed to in the Office Action is not "an outline part" but a program selection signal for selecting a desired video data. It is respectfully submitted that the "control signal" of Ebisawa is unrelated to the recited "outline part for informing a user of an outline of the desired program."

Further, the recited transmission means transmits the outline part followed by the supplement part. Ebisawa's transmitter encodes the "control signal" with the video data for transmission and the receiving apparatus decodes the received signal to restore the control signal and the video data. Therefore, in the system of Ebisawa, the "control signal" and the video data are transmitted and received simultaneously.

Even assuming arguendo that the sequentially stored video data of Ebisawa is the outline part and supplement part, when the first ten minutes of PROGRAM-1 are transmitted after the second ten minutes of PROGRAM1, the system of

Ebisawa finishes receiving the latter before completing the reproduction of the former and no recombination is performed.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 24, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Ebisawa.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ebisawa in view of Kitabatake.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, which rejection over Ebisawa has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Kitabatake that somehow could be combined with Ebisawa and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentably distinct over Ebisawa and Kitabatake.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ebisawa in view of Tsutsui et al.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, which rejection over Ebisawa has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Tsutsui et al. that somehow could be combined with Ebisawa and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is patentably distinct over Ebisawa and Tsutsui et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ebisawa in view of Tsuga et al.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, which rejection over Ebisawa has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Tsuga et al. that somehow could be combined with Ebisawa and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinct over Ebisawa and Tsuga et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ebisawa in view of Schoen et al..

Claim 7 depends from claim 1, which rejection over Ebisawa has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Schoen et al. that somehow could be combined with Ebisawa and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is patentably distinct over Ebisawa and Schoen et al.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP

Pedro C. Fernandez

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213
Pedro C. Fernandez
Reg. No. 41,741

JHM/PCF:tl